DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 309 683 HE 022 540

AUTHOR Reynolds, Anne
TITLE Knowing One's World: Gender and World View in a Research University Culture.
PUB DATE Mar 89
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, March 27-31, 1989).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Beliefs; College Faculty; Higher Education; Individual Differences; Opinions; Organizational Climate; *Research Universities; *Sex Differences; Sex Role; *Social Attitudes

ABSTRACT

A qualitative study exploring the relationships between gender and world view as they manifested themselves in the experiences of 19 beginning faculty members within an elite research university is described. The study was directed by the following questions: (1) Do women and men interpret differently their experiences as beginning faculty in a research university? (2) Do these interpretations reflect gender-related differences in world view? and (3) What happens to those world view differences over time? The major source of data for the study was four semi-structured, tape-recorded interviews with each informant. Informal conversations with and observations of faculty at faculty gatherings were also conducted. Findings are discussed according to gender and experiences during the junior years, gender and world view, and changes in the world over time. All of the findings of changes in world view suggest that an acculturation model rather than the more commonly posited socialization model is appropriate for some beginning professors. In creating a tentative acculturation model, three categories of acculturation are adapted from Spindler and Spindler: adopters, adapters, and rejecters/transformers. The most serious study finding is the move some junior faculty experienced from a relational world view to a more separatist one. It is suggested that researchers look further at the reality of gendered world views and investigate the influence of world view on the legitimization and transmission of knowledge. (SM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED309683

KNOWING ONE'S WORLD: Gender and World View in a Research University Culture

Anne Reynolds
Educational Testing Service

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Anne Reynolds

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA, March, 1989

HE 022 540

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Knowing One's World: Gender and World View in a Research University Culture

Anne Reynolds
Educational Testing Service, Princeton, NJ

I: Introduction

Bandied about in feminist literature and the popular press is the claim of gender-related differences in world view (e.g., Dunlop, 1982; Jensen, 1982; Keller, 1986; Ruth, 1978). This claim is intuitively appealing, yet from my reading of the social science literature, the empirical research base does not adequately support such an assertion.

Historically, anthropological research has described the theory of world view in terms of cross-cultural differences and not in terms of gender differences within these cultures. Only lately has the ethnological literature, informed by the ethnographies of women in non-Western cultures (e.g., Quinn, 1977; Shostak, 1981), entertained questions of intra-cultural similarities and differences between the sexes. This newer gender-conscious literature focuses mainly on women's status and roles in various cultures (e.g., Rosaldo & Lamphere, 1974; Schlegel, 1977), the determinants of sex roles (e.g., Friedl, 1975), and the meanings of gender and sexuality as cultural and social constructs (e.g., Ortner & Whitehead, 1981). But this literature does not speak in terms of world view.

Outside of anthropology, aspects of world view, such as SELF, OTHER, and RELATIONSHIP OF SELF TO OTHER, are spotlighted in feminist research in psychology (e.g., Gilligan, 1982; Lauter & Rupprecht, 1985) and theology (e.g., Cooey, Farmer, Ross, 1987; Noddings, 1984, 1985; Randour, 1987; Tronto, 1987; Ulanov, 1981). Other dimensions of world view are also occasionally investigated: gender-related perceptions of TIME (Cottle, 1976), SPACE (e.g., Ardener, 1981; Wekerle, Peterson, & Morley, 1980), and gender-related meanings given to concepts like competition and cooperation (e.g., Kohn, 1986). But, despite the availability of world view frameworks (e.g., Kearney, 1984), little research focuses specifically on gender-related differences in world view within a given culture.

The qualitative study described in this paper explores the relationships between gender and world view as they manifested themselves in the experiences of beginning faculty within an elite research university. The following questions directed the study:

(1) Do women and men interpret differently their experiences as beginning faculty in a research university? If so, in what ways?
(2) Do these interpretations reflect gender-related differences in world view?
(3) What happens to these world view differences over time?

In Section II of the paper, I provide a description of the conceptual framework and the methodology used to collect and analyze the data. In Section III, I bring together the findings of the study and discuss them in light of other studies. In Section IV, I acknowledge the limitations of the study and conclude with some concerns that remain in my mind.

II: Conceptual Framework and Methodology

Conceptual Framework

As Geertz (1973) elaborated, the world view of a cultural group encompasses the cognitive, existential "picture of the way things in sheer actuality are, their concept of nature, of self, of society (p. 126)." The model of world view I adapted as a frame for my study was proposed by Kearney (1984). Kearney's model comprehensively and logically integrates seven conceptual categories of world view: SELF, OTHER, RELATIONSHIP OF SELF TO OTHER, TIME, CAUSALITY, CLASSIFICATION, and SPACE.

I defined the category SELF as the perceptions and expectations professors had of and for themselves prior to becoming professors and during their first years in the university.

Likewise, I defined the category OTHER to be the perceptions and expectations informants had of and for other people (colleagues, students, staff, etc.) and their subject matter as they began their careers in academia.

The category RELATIONSHIP OF SELF TO OTHER referred to the perceptions and expectations informants thought others had of and for them during their early years as professors.

TIME referred to the conceptions informants had of time: where their "year" began and ended, what they considered "free" time and what was "work" time, how they spent their time in their professional lives (and personal lives where there was overlap or conflict with their professional lives) during their beginning years and at the time of the interviews.

The ways professors talked about and divided up their material world (e.g., offices, labs, where they ate lunch) and social world

(e.g., who were colleagues, who were not) reflected their images of SPACE.

CAUSALITY referred to the rationale professors gave for their actions, that is, their answers to "why" questions, such as: "Why do you choose research over teaching? Why do you seldom interact with your junior colleagues?" It was also seen in the informants' career decisions and in their perception of time allocations as being of their own choice and/or the choice imposed by others.

CLASSIFICATION referred to the meanings professors gave to terminology that divided the academic world; for example, the various roles they played in their professional lives (such as colleague, teacher, researcher), as well as the terms they used (such as collaboration, departmental support, productivity).

Data Collection

Informants. Nineteen faculty members at an elite research institution in the United States formed the nucleus of the study. These key informants (Spradley, 1979; Zelditch, 1962) were criterion-base selected[1] (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984) according to willingness to participate and representativeness of three areas of possible comparison and contrast in world view: gender (9 women; 10 men), status (11 pre-tenure; 8 tenured), and field of work (7 Natural Sciences; 8 Social Sciences; 4 Humanities). See Table 1.

Insert Table 1 about here

Eight of the informants (three men, five women) were married, and seven (five men, two women) had children. Age-wise, three men were in their early fifties to mid-sixties; the other informants split evenly above and below the mid-thirties (three men/five women and four men/four women, respectively). Geographically, they spanned the United States: Six of the informants (two men, four women) were raised in the Midwest; six (four men, two women) were raised in the East; one woman was raised in the South; five (three men, two women) were raised in the West; one man was raised outside of the United States. All had attended name schools, such as Harvard and Berkeley, for their undergraduate work, and top research universities, such as Stanford, MIT, and the University of Michigan, for their graduate work. All but seven informants began their academic careers at the university where my research took place. Of those who started elsewhere, only one came to the present university after more than five years at other schools.

Other formal participants included three retired professors and two university administrators whose positions required interaction

with junior and senior faculty members and with other administrators. I had informal contact with students and with other faculty members. This supplemental group of informants provided contextual data for the self-report data collected from the key informants.

Strategies for Data Collection. It took over a year to conduct interviews with professors and administrators, to obtain archival evidence, and to be a participant observer at meetings where faculty members were present.

The major source of data for the study was four, semi-structured, tape-recorded interviews with each informant. Prior to the interviews, I gave the informants a verbal description of the project and included a brief review of the rationale described above. In the interviews, which were constructed around the seven world view categories, I elicited information about the informants' experiences as beginning professors, their perceptions and assumptions of and affective responses to life as professors, their underlying values, and their professional duties in the university. Interviews with other participants, such as university administrators and retired professors, were less structured and more open-ended, but covered many of the same topics. All of the interviews were transcribed verbatim and returned to informants for any deletions, additions, or "off-the-record" comments.

To supplement and triangulate the interviews, I also had informal conversations with and made observations of faculty at faculty gatherings, such as an American Association of University Professors-sponsored session on tenure. I was a participant observer at university-sponsored career talks given by faculty members, and I collected written documents and archival records (such as curricula vitae, job offer letters, letters from professional associates, publishers, etc.) from individuals and university archives.

Data Analysis

The intent of this study was to uncover the meanings individual professors gave to their actions and to analyze these meanings with regard to gender. Thus, I inductively analyzed the data by systematically searching for confirming and disconfirming evidence to answer my guiding questions (Erickson, 1986). At times I used simple descriptive statistics to determine whether or not a theme was valid for further investigation as a gender-related difference. The analysis took the form of five stages.

In Stage 1, I transcribed and memoed[2] the interview tapes into computer files and created an organizational scheme for the data. In Stage 2, I coded the transcripts and other data according to the seven world view categories in the conceptual framework: SELF, OTHER, RELATIONSHIP OF SELF TO OTHER, TIME, SPACE, CAUSALITY, and

CLASSIFICATION. I also coded for four other categories: problems during the early years of a professorship, career influences, stories, and passages significant for a methodological appendix (Whyte, 1943). As I read through the transcripts and coded for the eleven categories, I asked myself, "What is this a case of? Why does this bit of evidence fit into this category?" The answers to these questions helped me to form a running account of subcategories for each major category. In Stage 3, I honed the coding categories to reflect a finer interpretation of what each piece of evidence meant for a category. I asked myself, "How is this a case of the major and minor categories?" In Stage 4, I created narrative text displays and conceptual clusters (Miles & Huberman, 1984) to enable me to move up the abstraction ladder to look for possible themes. Stage 5 was much like reading a Sherlock Holmes novel. From the first clue onward, the hunt required closely reading the narrative text displays, reviewing the memos I had written during Stage 1, and following leads from one category to the next. The results of this investigation were empirical assertions to answer my guiding questions.

III: Findings and Suggestions

I begin with my findings concerning the gender-related differences in experiences and interpretation of experiences during the early years of the professoriate. Next, I present the findings of gender-related differences in world view. Finally, I address the issue of what happens to these world view differences over time.

Gender and Experiences During the Junior Years

The first question guiding this study was: Do women and men interpret differently their experiences as beginning faculty in a research university? If so, in what ways? To answer this question, I analyzed the problems informants described and the stories they told about their junior years.

Some problems junior faculty faced were relatively benign (e.g., finishing a dissertation, setting up a new lab, getting oriented to the physical layout of the campus); they were short-lived and caused frustration, but negligible changes in world view. Other problems were more acute; they were symptomatic of the stress of the early years in academe. How beginning professors established their identity as professors, how they dealt with isolation in their new environment, and how they coped with the pressures for tenure in a research university were windows into the changes that took place within their minds.

In analyzing the problems that emerged during the analysis, I found that a majority of the women informants felt like misfits in their departments due to their status as females; this was not the case for men. Eileen recalled sitting in the first faculty meeting

feeling "out of place" and then looking at the pictures of previous women faculty members on the walls:

> And it was a wonderful thing to focus on, that there had been this tradition, that there had been women before. There were beautiful young women, lecturers; none of them ever got promoted all the way up. I would sit in that faculty meeting and it would be my way of feeling less alone.

Also, women expressed having more difficulty than men in coping with the strains of tenure, again attributed to their status as female. As Greta stated,

> There's too much responsibility for things that have nothing to do with me personally, but they've been kind of dumped on me as a woman, and I'm sick of having to deal with that role. So, I think that that is an underlying thing that creates a certain amount of tension and just sort of underlying exhaustion and uses up energy that otherwise could be directed at more useful things.

Informants told five types of stories about their junior years: (1) personal stories involving other professors; (2) personal stories involving administrators; (3) personal stories involving students and technicians; (4) personal stories involving only the individual professor; and (5) hearsay stories involving other people.

Gender did not seem to be important in the number of stories informants told, their representation in the categories of stories, or in their active or passive participation in the stories. Yet, in 11% of the stories told by both men and women, gender was a factor. For example, Jeff related a story about a senior faculty member in his department:

> [T]here's a colleague of mine who had a woman who committed suicide in his group, and I can tell you that he has said that he simply can't take another woman into his group. Now, is that a sexist thing? Of course it's a sexist thing. But here's a guy who's had an incredibly traumatic experience, and we're all human, and if there's a problem, you want to try to find a solution, and that's his solution to it.

No clear-cut gender differences emerged from the analysis of problems and stories. Among the informants in my study, individual differences in experiences were more significant than gender differences. However, gender did affect the meanings given to experiences of the junior years, if ever so slightly. These findings might be a reflection of the fact that as a woman researcher, relating

their problems and stories to me may have been easier for the women informants. Men may have felt uncomfortable telling me about their own experiences. Or the findings might be an indication that gender is significant in giving meaning to the experiences of the junior faculty years. Whichever the case, it needs to be stressed that individual differences overshadowed gender differences in the experiences of my informants.

Gender and World View

Though gender differences in experiences were less significant than individual differences, I re-analyzed the data according to the second question guiding the study: Do these interpretations (of experiences) reflect gender differences in world view?

In all but three of the world view categories, gender differences did not emerge. Only in the categories of RELATIONSHIP OF SELF TO OTHER, CAUSALITY, and CLASSIFICATION were gender differences salient. Two pieces of evidence suggested that overall, women informants were more intent on building and maintaining relationships with their colleagues and families than men informants.

First, from the category of RELATIONSHIP OF SELF TO OTHER, women informants saw themselves as active in maintaining their family relationships, while men did not.[3] For example, Ralph and his significant other moved to the university together, bought a house, settled down, and then broke up. Ralph described one reason for their break-up:

> So, I think that was a time when I was not willing, basically, to take time away from my career that would have been needed to keep things together. But, I think she, in particular, was changing a lot. And for me to keep up with those changes would have required an effort that I couldn't put in at that time, and she was not willing to understand that this was my first year as a professor--I really had to do all these things.

No women mentioned placing their relationships with significant others second to their university work; rather the women who were involved in significant other relationships purposefully planned their schedules so they could spend time with their spouses. For example, Laura and her husband built "together-time" into their daily activities: They shopped and cooked dinner together; they accompanied each other to their respective labs, where one read while the other worked; and they took short vacations in conjunction with conferences.

Second, from the categories of CAUSALITY and CLASSIFICATION: Women made three times as many comments about collegiality than did men, and women's incentives for seeking collaborative work focused on

personal needs, such as a desire to build collegial relationships, whereas men's incentives were centered more on non-personal needs, such as a need for research funds or to complete a designated task.[4] For example, Nancy spoke of making appointments with colleagues to find out about them; in addition, she actively participated in a discussion group in order to have social and intellectual interaction with her colleagues. A contrasting example is Jason, who spoke of going to a colleague for support for an initiative to change a program in the department.

Though the data are thin, this overall finding from the analysis of world view categories--women informants were more intent on building and maintaining relationships with their colleagues and families than men informants--is significant, for it partially supports the belief that women and men have different world views. The moral development researchers Gilligan (1982) and Lyons (1983) theorize about the "Connected Self" and the "Separate Self." They postulate that the Connected Self, which they found more often in women, experiences relationships as a response to others in their terms, maintains caring and connection with others, and grounds itself in interdependence. The Separate Self, found more often in men, experiences relationships in terms of reciprocity between separate individuals, maintains fairness and reciprocity with others, and grounds itself in roles that are based on obligations and duties (Lyons, 1983). Moving these psychological conceptions of self to the realm of philosophy, Noddings (1984) argues for a feminine ethic of "caring." My findings partially support these theories.

Why did I find so few overall gender differences in my analyses of the world view data? Two reasons seem probable: methodological and cultural.

Critics might argue that the theoretical framework I used was limited by preordained categories that arose out of a masculinist need to parse the social and physical world into discrete units. Had I constructed a framework from women's experiences, instead of imposing one on them, I might have found different results. In part, I agree with this argument, yet it is unlikely that the world view categories I used are meaningless for women's lives.

World view categories are an analytical tool for understanding the ostensible homogeneity of a given culture. By themselves, they are only placeholders for the meanings individuals give to their experiences. In each culture, world view concepts, such as RELATIONSHIP OF SELF TO OTHER, take on meanings peculiar to that culture (Shweder & Bourne, 1984). Rather than reject the categories outright, it seems more appropriate to think of some of the categories as collapsed into each other. For example, some feminist theologians argue that SELF has no meaning without OTHER and that SELF and OTHER are not discrete categories for women; they are only distinguishable

when they are seen in relationship to each other (e.g., Cooey, Farmer, & Ross, 1987.) Other feminist theologians argue for a balance between relationship and distinct conceptions of SELF and OTHER (Randour, 1987). In my own data, this melding of SELF and OTHER into RELATIONSHIP OF SELF TO OTHER has validity, given the finding that women informants seemed to value the relational aspects of their work more than the men informants. However, it is important to underscore the point that both women and men held this relational view. Further research is needed in this area.

From a cultural perspective, it is a wonder that any gender differences emerged at all in my study, for one might argue that the women who made it into the predominantly male culture of the elite research university had already learned to think and act like their male colleagues. Yet some gender differences did emerge. These differences are consistent with the ingrained Western cultural definitions of women as more involved and interested in the relational aspects of life than men. My findings illustrate the strong influence of the larger culture on subcultures, such as the elite research university. Despite immersion in the male world of the research university, the social construction of "woman" continued to influence many of my female informants' interpretations of their junior year experiences. Similarly, the male informants' gendered views of themselves and their female colleagues reinforced larger cultural definitions and affected their interpretations of their experiences.

Changes in World View Over Time

Once I had established that gender seemed to matter in the interpretation of experiences--even if ever so slightly--and that gender differences in some dimensions of world view seemed likely, I addressed the third question driving this study: What happens to these world view differences over time? To do this, I analyzed the data for comments informants made about changes they had noticed in themselves.

All informants spoke of changes they had made during their years in the institution. Women reported making more changes than men reported. In some informants, these changes appeared to be changes in aspects of world view, such as perceptions of and expectations for themselves and in their interactions with others.

One change was in the perception of self as an academic. For example, there was little mismatch between Cory's perceptions and expectations for himself and the university's expectations for him as he went through his junior years. He did his research and was tenured. However, over time, his original attitude toward the "lone scholar" research model (i.e., the non-collaborative model) changed as he learned more about the effects of stress on individuals and as he

shared more research ventures with other professors. Cory's new perception of himself as a collaborator altered his mode of research.

Another change was in the perception of self as a person. For example, Paula's perception of herself as non-aggressive changed over the course of her early years. She felt the frustration of not getting what she needed in the department and watched as others "yelled and screamed" and got results. She tried out their approach, found that it worked, and adopted it as her own. Through action, Paula experienced success and began to see herself as more self-confident and assertive.

Other informants spoke of changes in their interactions with others. For example, Nancy came into the professoriate expecting a minimal amount of collegiality. What she experienced was close to zero. She saw herself changing from someone who was interactive and involved with colleagues to someone who was isolated and detached from them. She commented,

> And what I find is that my norms have changed so that...if I walk by somebody's office and their door's open, it no longer occurs to me to stop and say hello. We have a new faculty member across the hall, and I used to think, how could somebody possibly be just a few steps away and not be constantly going--and now it never occurs to me to go over there and say hello....So, clearly my behavior and my sense of what you do has changed a lot in the last year.

For other informants, such as Ralph, changes in interaction with others were more in the roles they played than in aspects of world view. Ralph came into the university determined to be the type of advisor that his graduate school advisors had been with him--tough, demanding, and brutally honest. His relationships with students deteriorated, and he found he had to change his behavior. He became less caustic with students whom he thought were unable to take his criticisms. He was pleased to see that these students responded to him better that way, though he stuck to his belief that advisors should be tough, demanding, and brutally honest.

In one informant, Josie, changes could have occurred, but she left the culture in order <u>not</u> to change herself. Josie recognized a lack of fit between the university's publication expectations for junior faculty and her own for herself. After her child was born, Josie realized that she no longer wanted to spend her non-teaching time publishing papers. She wanted to spend it with her family. Instead of changing her publication standards to make herself more tenurable, Josie chose to leave the university before the tenure process got under way.

A mismatch between beginning professors' perceptions of and expectations for themselves and other's expectations for them sometimes provokes faculty to leave the university. Farnsworth and Toombs (1988) found that a high percentage (16%) of the assistant professors in their sample cited tenure denial as a reason for leaving academia, but junior faculty members also cited peer group interaction, the academic climate, work inequities, and the types of facilities and resources available to them.

All of the findings of changes in world view suggest that an acculturation model rather than the more commonly posited socialization model (e.g., Connolly, 1969) is appropriate for some beginning professors. Socialization and acculturation are often used interchangeably, but they are theoretically distinct. Socialization refers to the process by which an individual learns to adjust to a new group by acquiring the norms, values, and behaviors of the group. Socialization (or, in anthropological terms, enculturation) assumes a congruence between the individual's world view and that of the new group (Herskovits, 1948). Acculturation, like socialization, refers to the process by which an individual comes to be part of a new group. However, unlike socialization, acculturation assumes differences in world view between the individual and the group and results in a variety of adaptive strategies (Spindler, 1977).

In my reading, I came across only one acculturation model for faculty members (Jensen, 1982). This model asserts that academic women fall into three categories of adaptation to the university culture: (1) reoriented--these women take on the norms of the male academic culture; (2) reaffirmed--these women try to maintain traditional feminine roles and values while taking on the newer professional norms; and (3) reconstituted--these women attempt to reformulate their professional lives into something more compatible with female traditional cultural norms. However, my study indicates that some men may also experience acculturation. For example, Jason seemed to fit into the reaffirmed category. He wanted to be an integral part in raising his children, yet he felt pressured by the performance standards of his faculty peers to conform. In order to fit both into his day, he worked many late nights and early mornings. In contrast, Cory regarded himself as a deviant father during his junior years. He commented, "In retrospect, I was not aware of it at the time but I certainly have become aware that I was derelict in my duties as a father. I worked all the time. Six, seven days a week--if not involved, I was preoccupied with it."

In creating my own tentative acculturation model, I adapted three categories of acculturation from Spindler and Spindler (1971): adopters, adapters, rejectors/transformers.

Adopters. These beginning professors adopt the university culture's world view and take on the new culture's customs, attitudes,

and beliefs; they become part of the status quo in terms of research topics and methods and forms of communicating their research results. Adopters may segment their world views into public and private life spaces. In a kind of schizophrenic way, some adopters see through the dominant world view at work and through the personal world view outside of the faculty culture. In Jensen's model, these are the "Reoriented" and some of the "Reaffirmed." Jason is an example of a somewhat schizophrenic adopter. At the time of our interviews, he was contemplating a move to a less demanding university, not because he felt he could not become tenured, but because the strain of trying to be a good father and husband and a good academic in this particular academic culture weighed heavily on him.

Adapters. Beginning professors in this category minimize the psychic and organizational tensions inherent in conflicting world views by creating their own niches in the faculty culture. These niches may be intra-role (e.g., spending more time teaching or advising students than researching) and/or intra-discipline (e.g., choosing a specialty within a discipline that causes less conflict with their world view). In Jensen's model, these are the "Reconstituted," and some of the "Reaffirmed." Nancy straddled the adopter/adapter fence. While she saw herself adopting the isolationist attitude prevalent in her department, she minimized the tension by working more closely with her graduate students and by participating in lunchtime discussion groups.

Rejectors/Transformers. People in this category sense a mismatch between their world view and that of the university culture. Jensen's categories do not include rejectors or transformers, but other research on faculty decisions to leave academia suggests that this category is viable (e.g., Farnsworth & Toombs, 1988; Pearson, 1986). Instead of altering their world view, rejectors move to another culture where the fit is better. Josie exemplifies the rejectors. Transformers remain in the institution and work to mold it into one more compatible with their own world view (e.g., starting new inter-disciplinary programs). In my study, Eileen typifies a transformer, for she actively worked to change cultural norms through her choice of research problems and her leadership in non-traditional academic programs.

Transformers might be the most important group of faculty members to study in future research, for they are harbingers of socio-cultural change in the university. A recent investigation of the creation and legitimization of new knowledge in higher education--feminist studies--describes a group of women who fit within the transformer side of this category (Gumport, 1987).

IV: Final Thoughts about the Study

I begin this section with a few caveats about the generalizability of the findings and conclude the paper with a few thoughts about the significance of my findings for the future role of academia in society.

Limitations to the Study

As with all studies, there are certain limitations to the universality of the findings. First, the informants in the study were a select group. They came out of top research university graduate programs--Harvard, MIT, Chicago. Likewise, they were designated among the top researchers in their particular fields, or top graduate students, if it was their first academic appointment. Thus, their experiences might have been markedly different from junior faculty members at other universities, especially those at teaching-oriented institutions.

Second, despite their seeming similarities, differences were also noticeable among the group, notably, in socio-economic background, historical era in which they grew up, race, and sexual orientation. For example, four of my informants came from lower middle-class backgrounds where neither or only one parent had attended college. Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, and Tarule (1986) discuss the stages of knowledge growth in women from various socio-economic backgrounds. Their findings, along with those of Ryan and Sackrey (1984) suggest that class is salient in shaping world view. It is likely that faculty members who come from families where they are among the first to go to college will have different perceptions of and expectations for themselves as creators and disseminators of knowledge than those who come from families where higher education is the norm. This is an area where further studies might give important insights into the shaping of world views.

Additionally, the informants were of different ages, which may have affected their world views. For example, Mark and Jason were in college during the Vietnam war. Their perceptions of what kinds of research were and were not acceptable were influenced by their political involvement in the anti-war movement. This is an important point to stress, for one might argue that my interpretation of changes in world view fails to take into account the developmental changes that occur in junior faculty members' lives as they begin to establish families and more solid self-identities. Instead of acculturation taking place, what I have interpreted as world view changes may be just further socialization into a single world view. More research is needed before this argument can be settled.

Third, the methodology I employed relied on informant discussions of their own thoughts and behaviors during their early years as

professors--a methodology often criticized as unreliable and invalid.[5] Had I been able to observe informants during the course of their early years as professors, a different picture might have developed, since world view manifests itself in observable behaviors, too. Future studies of this kind should incorporate longer periods of participant observation.

Significance of the Research in the Larger Picture

What I take to be the most serious finding in my study is the move some junior faculty experienced from a relational world view to a more separatist one. If, as Gumport's (1987) study suggests, gender and world view do affect the creation and dissemination of knowledge, then faculty cultures such as the one in my study may actually impede the development of knowledge and the practices that emanate from a relational world view. In other words, what may be "natural" from a relational world view, such as collaborative research or saying hello to the professor across the hall, may appear "unnatural" from a separatist world view and thus be discouraged or even squelched.

If there are gender differences in world view--and my study is only a preliminary attempt to document and systematically analyze for them--then should we not be concerned about the cooptation of one world view by the other, especially in an institution that creates and disseminates knowledge throughout society? I join Wilshire (1987) and propose that we scrutinize the appropriateness of the norms, values, beliefs, and practices of research universities as they now exist. At the same time, I suggest that we look further at the reality of gendered world views and investigate the influence of world view on the legitimization and transmission of knowledge.

References

Ardener, S. (1981). Ground rules and social maps for women: An introduction. In S. Ardener, (Ed.), Women and space. Ground rules and social maps (pp. 11-34). New York: St. Martin's Press, Inc.

Belenky, M. F., Clinchy, B. M., Goldberger, N. R., & Tarule, J. M. (1986). Women's ways of knowing. The development of self, voice, and mind. New York: Basic Books, Inc.

Bernard, H. R., Killworth, P., Kronenfeld, D., & Sailer, L. (1984). The problem of informant accuracy: The validity of retrospective data. In B. J. Siegel, A. R. Beals, & S. A. Tyler (Eds.), Annual Review of Anthropology (Volume 13), 495-517.

Connolly, J. J. (1969). Viewing faculty orientation as a socialization process. (ERIC Reproduction Service No. ED 031 226)

Cooey, P. M., Farmer, S. A., & Ross, M. E. (Eds.). (1987). Embodied love. Sensuality and relationship as feminist values. San Francisco: Harper & Row.

Cottle, T. J. (1976). Perceiving time. A psychological investigation with men and women. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Dunlop, F. (1982). The ideas of male and female: A prolegomenon to the question of educational sex-bias. Journal of Philosophy of Education, 16(2), 209-222.

Erickson, F. (1986). Qualitative methods in research on teaching. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of Research on Teaching, Third Edition (pp. 119-161). New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.

Farnsworth, W. M., & Toombs, W. (April, 1988). Decisions to leave: Dimensions of faculty choice. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Friedl, E. (1975). Women and men. An anthropologist's view. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press, Inc.

Geertz, C. (1973). The interpretation of cultures. New York: Basic Books, Inc.

Gilligan, C. (1982). In a different voice. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Goetz, J. P., & LeCompte, M. D. (1984). Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research. New York: Academic Press, Inc.

Gumport, P. J. (1987). The social construction of knowledge: Individual and institutional commitments to feminist scholarship. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, Stanford, CA.

Herskovits, M. J. (1948). Man and his works. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc.

Jensen, K. (1982). Women's work and academic culture: Adaptations and confrontations. Higher Education, 11, 67-83.

Kearney, M. (1984). World view. Novato, CA: Chandler & Sharp Publishers, Inc.

Keller, C. (1986). From a broken web. Separation, sexism, and self. Boston: Beacon Press.

Kohn, A. (1986). No contest. The case against competition. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Company.

Lauter, E., & Rupprecht, C. S. (Eds.). (1985). Feminist archetypal theory. Knoxville, TN: The University of Tennessee Press.

Lyons, N. P. (1983). Two perspectives: On self, relationships, and morality. Harvard Educational Review, 53(2), 125-145.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1984). Qualitative data analysis. A sourcebook of new methods. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Noddings, N. (1984). Caring. A feminine approach to ethics and moral education. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Noddings, N. (1985). In search of the feminine. Teachers College Record, 87(2), 195-204.

Ortner, S. B., & Whitehead, H. (1981). Sexual meanings. The cultural construction of gender and sexuality. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pearson, J. C. (1986, November). Academic women: How to succeed in the university. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Chicago, IL.

Quinn, N. (1977). Anthropological studies on women's status. Annual Review of Anthropology, 6, 181-225.

Randour, M. L. (1987). Women's psyche, women's spirit. The reality of relationships. New York: Columbia University Press.

Rosaldo, M. Z., & Lamphere, L. (Eds.). (1974). Woman, culture, and society. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Ruth, S. (1978). A feminist world-view. Women's Studies International Quarterly, 1, 247-254.

Ryan, J., & Sackrey, C. (1984). Strangers in paradise. Academics from the working class. Boston: South End Press.

Schlegel, A. (Ed.). (1977). Sexual stratification: A cross cultural view. New York: Columbia University Press.

Shostak, M. (1981). Nisa. The life and words of a !Kung woman. New York: Vintage Books.

Shweder, R. A., & Bourne, E. J. (1984). Does the concept of the person vary cross-culturally? In R. A. Shweder & R. A. LeVine (Eds.), Culture theory. Essays on mind, self, and emotion (pp. 158-199). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Spindler, G, & Spindler, L. (1971). Dreamers with power. The Menominee. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press, Inc.

Spindler, L. (1977). Culture change and modernization: Mini-models and case studies. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press, Inc.

Spradley, J. P. (1979). The ethnographic interview. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Tronto, J. C. (1987). Beyond gender difference to a theory of care. Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 12(4), 644-663.

Ulanov, A. B. (1981). Receiving woman. Studies in the psychology and theology of the feminine. Philadelphia, PA: The Westminster Press.

Wekerle, G. R., Peterson, R., Morley, D. (Eds.). (1980). New space for women. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Whyte, W. F. (1943). Street corner society: The social structure of an Italian slum. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Wilshire, B. (1987). Can the university defend the values upon which it stands? Journal of Higher Education, 58(3), 249-260.

Zelditch, M. (1962). Some methodological problems of field studies. American Journal of Sociology, 67, 566-576.

Footnotes

[1]To use criterion-base selection, the researcher chooses important characteristics an informant should have, then seeks out people who will fit these characteristics.

[2]Memoing involves keeping a running list of one's own thoughts and conceptual remarks about the study. See Miles and Huberman (1984, p. 69) for a discussion of memoing.

[3]Exceptions: Jason took his turn at the cooperative day care; Mark got up early to spend time with his daughter before she went to pre-school.

[4]Exception: Mark and another junior faculty member started a sherry hour, but dropped it when it became too much of an effort to get people to come.

[5]However, Bernard, Killworth, Kronenfeld, and Sailer (1984) summarized the literature on informant accuracy and concluded that though studies show that informants are inaccurate and that memory does decay over time, still little is known about how accurate informants are when they are reporting retrospective "facts." I tried to counter the problem of retrospective data by triangulating it with data from current beginning professors and retired faculty as well as from documentary evidence.

Table 1

Key Informants in the Study

	Social Sciences		Humanities		Natural Sciences	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Pre-tenure Faculty	Jason Clark+	Nancy Sandy+ Josie*	Scott	Mary	Ralph* Jeff Brad+	Laura
Tenured Faculty	Matt Cory*	Carol	Donald	Eileen	Mark	Paula* Greta

* Josie, Ralph, Paula, and Cory participated in the pilot study.

+ Clark, Sandy, and Brad were first-year professors at the time of the interviews.